

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

				:
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,361	12/10/2001	Gyorgy Lajos Kis	OP/V-30341B	6955
1095	7590 12/08/2003		EXAMINER	
THOMAS HOXIE  NOVARTIS, CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  ONE HEALTH PLAZA 430/2			JOYNES, ROBERT M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080		1615	12	
		•	DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003	19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/016,361	KIS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert M. Joynes	1615				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu.  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	I.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile  2. In no event, however, may a reply be tile  2. In no event, however, may a reply day  3. In no event, however, may a reply a r	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	September 2003.					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document of the priority document of the priority document of the certified copies of the priority document of the priority docum	nts have been received.  nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in Applicationity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  st of the certified copies not received in the certified copies not received in the specification of the specification application has been received in the specification of the specification application has been received in the specification of the specification application has been received in Application and the specification of the specification application has been received in Application and the specification of the specification application has been received in Application and the specification of the specification application application has been received in Application and the specification of the specification application application application application has been received in the specification application	ion No  ed in this National Stage  ed.  (e) (to a provisional application)  or in an Application Data Sheet.  ceived.  D and/or 121 since a specific				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal I	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1615

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants' Amendment and Declaration filed on September 25, 2003.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 12 recites that the composition is at a temperature of 120 degrees Celsius and is under 1.5 pars of pressure. It is unclear to the Examiner whether these are limitations that reflect conditions of the process of making the composition or if these are limitations of the storage of the composition, meaning if after its production the composition must be kept under these conditions. If the intent of the applicants were to recite these limitations as part of the method/process of making said composition, the claim would be better depending upon Claim 7.

Appropriate clarification or amendment is suggested.

# Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 13 depends upon Claim 12. Claim 12 recites that the amount of degradation product does

Art Unit: 1615

not exceed 0.23%. Claim 13 recites that the amount of degradation product is about 0.23%. The same situation occurs with Claims 5 and 14. Claim 5 recites the amount of degradation product does not exceed 0.03% while Claim 14 recites the amount of degradation product is about 0.03%. The dependent claims broaden the scope of the parent claims and therefore do not further limit the parents from which they depend. The Examiner interprets the term "about" to mean that the limitation can be within approximately 10% above or below the specific limitation recited. Therefore by saying about, the claim would or could include a limit outside of 0.23% or 0.03% respectively. Appropriate correction is suggested.

## Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 1615

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,547. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent No. 6,455,547 teaches a composition comprising a salt of ketotifen at a concentration of 0.0345%, glycerol at a concentration of 2.125% and benzalkonium chloride at a concentration of 0.01%. The composition further contains an antioxidant. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare an ophthalmic solution containing ketotifen, glycerol and benzalkonium chloride in the specific concentrations recited in the instant claims. The addition of the antioxidant does not materially change the composition of the instant claims and is therefore rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,455,547.

Applicants have filed a Terminal Disclaimer that obviates the previous double patenting rejection over U.S. Patent No. 6,395,756.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Due to the new grounds for rejection, this action is deemed non-final.

Art Unit: 1615

# Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Joynes whose telephone number is (703) 308-8869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 8:30 - 6:00, alternate Fri. 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3592.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Robert M. Joynes Patent Examiner Art Unit 1615 December 4, 2003

> THURMAN K PAGE SUPERVISORY PAPENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY COUTER 1600